

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-20, 22-39 and 41-46 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 46 is newly added. Support for new claim 46 may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraphs [0030]-[0032].

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection to Claim 22**

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 22 is respectfully requested in view of the amendments set forth above.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-35, 37-39 and 41-43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-35, 37-39 and 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandolfo (US 7,184,767) in view of Choi (US 6,967,944).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. As to independent claim 1, Gandolfo and Choi do not support the rejection for at least the reason that, even in combination, Gandolfo and Choi fail to disclose or suggest “exchanging messages with the foreign terminal if the pilot signal strength is below a threshold,” and “establishing a peer-to-peer connection with the foreign terminal,” as recited in claim 1.

Gandolfo is completely silent regarding any exchange of messages with a foreign terminal if a pilot strength of the terminal is below a threshold, as required by claim 1. The Office Action correctly recognizes the deficiencies in Gandolfo, and relies on Choi for the noted features of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action cites Choi at col. 5, lines 9-31 (Office Action, p. 3, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph).

However, Choi in no way relates to any exchange of messages with a foreign terminal based on a pilot signal strength being below a threshold, as in claim 1. For example, the cited portion of Choi merely describes a “return signal, which indicates the determined received signal strength level of each STA to the AP 14” (col. 5, lines 12-14). Such a “return signal” in no way corresponds to a pilot signal strength as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Gandolfo and Choi. Independent claims 20 and 39 include recitations similar to those of claim 1 and are therefore likewise allowable over Gandolfo and Choi. Moreover, the dependent claims are likewise allowable over Gandolfo and Choi for at least the reason that they depend one of claims 1 or 20, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 7, 12, 26 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 7, 12, 26 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandolfo in view of Choi, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US 2002/0080855) (“Watanabe”).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 7, 12, 26 and 31 depend on one of claims 1 or 20, and are therefore allowable over Gandolfo and Choi for at least reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Watanabe does not cure the deficiencies in Gandolfo and Choi, and therefore claims 7, 12, 26 and 31 are further allowable over the combination of Watanabe with Gandolfo and Choi. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

### **IV. Rejection of Claims 17 and 36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 17 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandolfo in view of Choi and further in view of Papasakellariou et al. (US 7,133,435) (“Papasakellariou”).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Along lines discussed above, claims 17 and 36 depend on one of claims 1 or 20, and are therefore allowable over Gandolfo and Choi for at least reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Papasakellariou does not cure the deficiencies in Gandolfo and Choi, and therefore claims 17 and 36 are further allowable over the combination of Papasakellariou with Gandolfo and Choi. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 44 and 45 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 44 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandolfo in view of Choi, and further in view of Icacono et al. (US 2005/017468) (“Icacono”).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Along lines discussed above, claims 44 and 45 depend on one of claims 1 or 20, and are therefore allowable over Gandolfo and Choi for at least reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Icacono does not cure the deficiencies in Gandolfo and Choi, and therefore claims 44 and 45 are further allowable over the combination of Icacono with Gandolfo and Choi. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

**VI. New Claim**

New claim 46 is clearly allowable over the art of record. None of the art of record discloses or suggests a communication device configured to, from a master terminal of a piconet, receive a designation as an edge terminal in the piconet, and based on being designated an edge terminal, listen for pilot signals from isolated terminals not included in the piconet, and if a pilot signal with a signal strength below a threshold is detected from an isolated terminal, add the isolated terminal to a peer-to-peer connectivity list, the peer-to-peer connectivity list identifying terminals outside the piconet that may be reached with peer-to-peer transmission, and forward a list to the isolated terminal identifying terminals included in the piconet, as recited in new claim 46.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [QUALP842US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/William E. Curry/

William E. Curry

Reg. No. 43,572

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
57<sup>TH</sup> Floor, Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731